

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION
CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT SURVEY**

PART I - INTRODUCTION & INSTRUCTION

The Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) is currently conducting a full and open competitive procurement under Solicitation No. DTFR53-02-R-00003 titled, "Post-Accident Toxicological Testing of Human Samples and Related Services." Each prospective offeror has been requested to identify Government agencies or commercial business firms it has previously contracted with or to whom it is currently under contract, to serve as potential references on its past performance record.

Offerors should follow the instructions in the solicitation and this Contractor Performance Assessment Survey for submitting past performance information. For each reference, offerors should submit past performance information with their offers, as outlined in the solicitation and Part II of this survey. As early as possible in the proposal preparation phase, offerors should advise their private sector and government references that they may be contacted by an FRA procurement official to participate in a telephone interview, using Part III of the survey as the focal point of the interview. References should not submit the survey, unless they are subsequently requested to do so by the FRA, but offerors may wish to provide their references with an advance copy for information purposes.

To ensure frank and open evaluations and expressions of opinions by evaluators, all parties are advised that the identity of respondents completing the survey will be held in confidence and will not be released or disclosed to the contractor or outside the Government. However, as specified under Federal Acquisition Regulation 15.306, conditions may exist in which the contractor may be provided an opportunity to discuss adverse past performance information on which the offeror has not had a previous opportunity to comment. Any relevant contractor performance evaluations prepared by the agency/firm providing this reference within the last three years, and responses/rebuttals from the contractor, may be requested to augment or furnished in lieu of this survey or interview.

For the purposes of this survey, the following descriptions should be used as general guidelines for rating the contractor on how well the contractor met or failed to meet the cost, schedule and performance requirements of the contract, and its business relations.

Exceptional (5) - Performance in the respective area of evaluation, consistently and reliably *far exceeded standards* or expectations as set forth in the contract, or as prior experience and knowledge of the industry would suggest or dictate. There were essentially *no major problems*, weaknesses, or deficiencies of consequence, nor negative performances issues as it applies to the respective area of evaluation. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with *few minor problems* for which the contractor took *highly effective and timely corrective action*.

Very Good (4) - Performance in the respective area of evaluation, consistently and reliably *exceeded standards* or expectations as set forth in the contract, or as prior experience and knowledge of the industry would suggest or dictate. There were essentially *no major problems*, weaknesses, or deficiencies of consequence, nor negative performances issues as it applies to the respective area of evaluation. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with *some minor problems* for which the contractor took *effective and timely corrective action*.

Satisfactory (3) - Performance in the respective area of evaluation, consistently and reliably *met standards* or expectations as set forth in the contract, or as prior experience and knowledge of the industry would suggest or dictate. There were essentially *no major problems*, weaknesses, or deficiencies of consequence, nor negative performances issues as it applies to the respective area of evaluation. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with *some minor problems* for which the contractor took *competent and timely corrective action*.

Marginal (2) - Performance in the respective area of evaluation, *did not meet standards* or expectations as set forth in the contract, or as prior experience and knowledge of the industry would suggest or dictate. There were problems, weaknesses, or deficiencies of consequence, or negative performances issues as it applies to the respective area of evaluation. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with *some minor problems and one or more major problems* for which the contractor took *minimal or ineffectual and/or untimely corrective action*.

Unsatisfactory (1) - Performance in the respective area of evaluation, *failed to meet standards* or expectations as set forth in the contract, or as prior experience and knowledge of the industry would suggest or dictate. There were problems, weaknesses, or deficiencies of consequence, or negative performances issues as it applies to the respective area of evaluation. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with *numerous minor and numerous major problems* for which the contractor took *virtually no, or minimal or ineffectual, and/or untimely corrective action*.

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION

The disclosure of which is restricted. See FAR 3.104

PART II - RELEVANCY & PERSPECTIVE

(To be completed and submitted by Offeror with its Offer)

Note: For each reference, the offeror is to complete and submit this survey page, or a substitute page in place of this survey page. Any substitute page used must conform to this survey page in all material respects (in terms of the information requested); and like this survey page, the offeror's substitute page used to respond to all fill-in information/ inquiries shall not exceed one page.

Name of Agency/Business Reference:			
Agency/Business Point of Contact (POC):			
POC Telephone No.	Fax No.	Email Address:	
Name of Offeror:			
Contract or Project Title:			
Contract Type (e.g., fixed price, cost-plus-fixed fee, etc.):			
Contract No.		Delivery/Task Order No.	
Performance Period(s):	Base Period- from	to	& Base plus All Options - from to
Dollar Value(s):	Base Period -	&	Base plus All Options -
Short Description of Supplies/Services the offeror furnished in the referenced contract/order. <i>(Approximately 5 lines)</i>			
Describe how the referenced contract/order is relevant to the subject contracting action being solicited –in terms of scope, magnitude, cost, human resources, or other aspects. Identify whether the offeror was the prime contractor, or a subcontractor or served in some other capacity/role or relationship. If the contractor/individual seeking a reference served as other than the prime contractor, provide the name of the prime, a primary point of contact, and telephone number of the prime contractor. <i>(Approximately 10 to 15 lines.)</i>			
The offeror may describe problems encountered in the identified contract/order and the demonstrated effectiveness of the offeror's corrective actions. The offeror may also describe any specific quality awards or quality certifications received in connection with the referenced contract/order. <i>(Approximately 5 lines)</i>			

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION

The disclosure of which is restricted. See FAR 3.104

PART III - EVALUATOR/RESPONDENT'S ASSESSMENT

(To be completed by Reference Evaluator/Respondent or Interviewer)

1. How would you rate the offeror on **Quality of Product or Service** –in terms of its compliance with contract requirements, accuracy of reports, technical excellence to include quality awards/certificates, or other quality-related contract standards?

QUALITY OF PRODUCT/SERVICE	Corresponding Adjectival & Numerical Ratings (<i>Circle one</i>)				
	Unsatisfactory	Marginal	Satisfactory	Very Good	Exceptional
	1	2	3	4	5

2. How would you rate the offeror on **Timeliness of Performance** –in terms of meeting milestones, reliability for providing quality services or furnishing completed deliverables on-time, adherence to contract schedules including contract administration, or other time-related contract standards?

TIMELINESS OF PERFORMANCE	Corresponding Adjectival & Numerical Ratings (<i>Circle one</i>)				
	Unsatisfactory	Marginal	Satisfactory	Very Good	Exceptional
	1	2	3	4	5

3. How would you rate the offeror on **Cost Control** –in terms of its ability to perform cost-type contracts within or below budget, use of cost efficiencies, adherence to negotiated/projected costs vice actual costs, submission of reasonably priced change proposals, and providing current, accurate, and complete billing in a timely fashion? For fixed price contracts, this area assesses whether the contractor met the original price/cost estimated or needed to negotiate cost changes to meet program requirements.

COST CONTROL	Corresponding Adjectival & Numerical Ratings (<i>Circle one</i>)				
	Unsatisfactory	Marginal	Satisfactory	Very Good	Exceptional
	1	2	3	4	5

4. How would you rate the offeror on **Business Relations** –in terms of its ability to provide effective management (to include meeting subcontracting goals for small, small disadvantaged, women-owned or other targeted businesses, when applicable), cooperative and proactive behavior with the end user, technical representative and/or the Contracting Officer, responsiveness to inquiries, problem resolution, and customer satisfaction with the overall service performance and/or the final product(s)?

BUSINESS RELATIONS	Corresponding Adjectival & Numerical Ratings (<i>Circle one</i>)				
	Unsatisfactory	Marginal	Satisfactory	Very Good	Exceptional
	1	2	3	4	5

Note: Additional sheets may be used to document comments or explain the rationale for the assigned adjectival/numerical ratings (i.e., recount specific extraordinary or poor contractor performance or problems and responsiveness to problems encountered).

PART IV - EVALUATOR/INTERVIEWER CONFIRMATION & SIGNATURE

(To be completed and signed by Evaluator/Respondent or Interviewer, as applicable)

Name of Offeror Evaluated:		
Name of Activity/Business Reference: Name of Evaluator/Interviewee: Evaluator/Interviewee's Position/Title (e.g., COTR, Task Monitor, Project Manager, etc.):		
Evaluator/Interviewee's Tel. No.	Fax No.	Email Address:
Name of Interviewer:		
Interviewer's Tel. No.	Fax No.	Email Address:
Signature (Evaluator/Interviewee or Interviewer, as applicable):		Date:

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION

The disclosure of which is restricted. See FAR 3.104